

**To:** Kumar, Ashij (EC)[ashij.kumar@canada.ca]; Barnes, Edlynzia[Barnes.Edlynzia@epa.gov]; Schardt, James[schardt.james@epa.gov]  
**From:** Wortman, Santina  
**Sent:** Thur 9/8/2016 7:06:34 PM  
**Subject:** RE: Progress Report of the Parties - Final Annex Review

Thank you so much Ash, that sounds perfect. I had noticed a few acronyms needing cleaning up too but didn't have time to fix.

Many thanks to you all!

Santina

**From:** Kumar, Ashij (EC) [mailto:ashij.kumar@canada.ca]  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 08, 2016 1:42 PM  
**To:** Wortman, Santina <Wortman.Santina@epa.gov>; Barnes, Edlynzia <Barnes.Edlynzia@epa.gov>; Schardt, James <schardt.james@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: Progress Report of the Parties - Final Annex Review

Santina - I'm going to paste this clean text into the US domestic section of the PRP. May clean up some acronyms if I can. Also, Alice confirmed the article is In Press and published online so I'll use this right below the figure and the link can be inserted: Source: Maccoux M.J., Dove A., Backus S.M., Dolan D.M. (In press). Total and soluble reactive phosphorus loadings to Lake Erie. Journal of Great Lakes Research [<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0380133016301460>]

Lynzi/Jamie - I hope to have a consolidated PRP tomorrow possibly but I did notice language that didn't seem clear (but could just be me) so I'll have to run my "proposed fixes" by Carla.

**From:** Schardt, James [mailto:schardt.james@epa.gov]  
**Sent:** September 7, 2016 3:20 PM  
**To:** Kumar, Ashij (EC)  
**Cc:** Barnes, Edlynzia; Schardt, James; Wortman, Santina  
**Subject:** FW: Progress Report of the Parties - Final Annex Review

Santina, I think so!

Ash, we have a couple more edits for Annex 4. Thanks!

-jamie

**From:** Wortman, Santina  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 07, 2016 2:18 PM  
**To:** Schardt, James <[schardt.james@epa.gov](mailto:schardt.james@epa.gov)>; Barnes, Edlynzia <[Barnes.Edlynzia@epa.gov](mailto:Barnes.Edlynzia@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: Progress Report of the Parties - Final Annex Review

Hi there – I didn't hear back from MDEQ but NYDEC provided 2 additional items highlighted in the attached.

Can we still add these in the US Domestic actions section?

Thanks

Santina

**From:** Schardt, James  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 01, 2016 4:01 PM  
**To:** Wortman, Santina <[Wortman.Santina@epa.gov](mailto:Wortman.Santina@epa.gov)>; Barnes, Edlynzia <[Barnes.Edlynzia@epa.gov](mailto:Barnes.Edlynzia@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: Progress Report of the Parties - Final Annex Review

I think so, looks like we will be working through next week on refining the text. Providing it

early next week would be ideal.

-j

**From:** Wortman, Santina  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 01, 2016 3:58 PM  
**To:** Barnes, Edlynzia <[Barnes.Edlynzia@epa.gov](mailto:Barnes.Edlynzia@epa.gov)>; Schardt, James <[schardt.james@epa.gov](mailto:schardt.james@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: Progress Report of the Parties - Final Annex Review

That is great news, thanks so much! One question I have is about the US domestic actions piece. MDEQ indicated they wanted to update their talking point on the Detroit WWTP but haven't sent me that language yet. Is it possible we can still make that update next week?

Santina

**From:** Barnes, Edlynzia  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 01, 2016 7:29 AM  
**To:** Wortman, Santina <[Wortman.Santina@epa.gov](mailto:Wortman.Santina@epa.gov)>; Schardt, James <[schardt.james@epa.gov](mailto:schardt.james@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: Progress Report of the Parties - Final Annex Review

Hi Santina – we went through the revised chapter that you sent us yesterday. We really appreciate your quick response to the short turnaround and I do apologize once again for the last minute update re. the Annex 4 final review. Good news, (hopefully) we have included all of your edits onto the report and will be reconciling with Canada next week for Secretariat review, Co-chair approval, and following the posting on binational.net. If any supplementary questions develop for Annex 4, I'll be sure to let you know. Have a great holiday!

Cheers,

Lynzi.

**From:** Wortman, Santana  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 31, 2016 10:08 PM  
**To:** Barnes, Edlynzia <[Barnes.Edlynzia@epa.gov](mailto:Barnes.Edlynzia@epa.gov)>; Schardt, James <[schardt.james@epa.gov](mailto:schardt.james@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: Progress Report of the Parties - Final Annex Review

Can you please confirm receipt of the revised document and let me know what next steps are?

Thank you,

Santina

**From:** Wortman, Santana  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 30, 2016 11:31 AM  
**To:** Barnes, Edlynzia <[Barnes.Edlynzia@epa.gov](mailto:Barnes.Edlynzia@epa.gov)>; Schardt, James <[schardt.james@epa.gov](mailto:schardt.james@epa.gov)>  
**Cc:** Lisa Duriancik (NRCS) <[Lisa.duriancik@wdc.usda.gov](mailto:Lisa.duriancik@wdc.usda.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: Progress Report of the Parties - Final Annex Review

Lyndzi & Jamie – sorry for so many edits at the last hour but as you know, I only received the draft last week and it has some significant changes from previous versions. I’m working as quickly as possible to review and improve the report in response to NRCS’s comments and other issues I’m finding.

Attached please find my edits which I added to NRCS’s comments. The bulk of the edits are to the Domestic Actions section. To improve flow, I’ve broken these into 3 categories: on the ground actions; monitoring and forecasting tools; nutrient mgt strategies, policies and legislative actions. Even though it’s a longer list I think you’ll find it more readable whereas before it was a hodgepodge. I also tried to provide a variety like Canada did for their section. If you (or those above you) find it’s too long and want to shorten – please consult me if you can because I’d like to have some input on what gets cut.

Red flags:

1. The statement on p 35 “While phosphorus reductions are required from all watersheds

entering Lake Erie,...” - **Is inaccurate and must be removed.** I’ve tried to clarify in the text that the reductions apply to Western & central basins.

2. The report is generally silent on the lack of a target for the Eastern basin. I elaborated on the statement p 34 – we will need ECCC to concur on this new language
3. MDARD recently joined our subcommittee – we need to add their logo. I did not have time to seek a talking point for their work.

I hope this is helpful. I am off the rest of the week but you can reach me by phone with any questions or concerns at (312) 857-8319.

Santina Wortman

U.S. EPA, Region 5

(312) 353-8319

[wortman.santina@epa.gov](mailto:wortman.santina@epa.gov)

**From:** Barnes, Edlynzia

**Sent:** Friday, August 26, 2016 9:18 AM

**To:** Wortman, Santina <[Wortman.Santina@epa.gov](mailto:Wortman.Santina@epa.gov)>

**Cc:** Hinchey, Elizabeth <[Hinchey.Elizabeth@epa.gov](mailto:Hinchey.Elizabeth@epa.gov)>; George, Sandra E <[Sandra.E.George@ec.gc.ca](mailto:Sandra.E.George@ec.gc.ca)>

**Subject:** FW: Progress Report of the Parties - Final Annex Review

Please see below.

**From:** Barnes, Edlynzia  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 17, 2016 10:35 AM  
**To:** Hyde, Tinka <[hyde.tinka@epa.gov](mailto:hyde.tinka@epa.gov)>  
**Cc:** James Schardt <[schardt.james@epa.gov](mailto:schardt.james@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** Progress Report of the Parties - Final Annex Review

Dear U.S. Nutrients Annex Co-lead:

Please find attached for your prompt review the latest draft Nutrients Annex chapter of the GLWQA Progress Report of the Parties. This chapter has been vetted and marked up by the Binational Secretariat and GLEC Co-Chairs and has a significant amount of new text when compared to the version that was distributed during the June GLEC meeting. (I note that this document is being shared with the Canadian co-leads as well.)

Due to limited time between now and the Great Lakes Public Forum, this is the final opportunity for you to review your Annex chapter before the Report is submitted to the Co-chairs for final approvals, followed by posting of the final published version on Binational.net. We are asking that you review the updated Annex chapter and, **by c.o.b August 25**, please let us know whether:

- 1) you have “**red flag**” concerns with the draft; or
- 2) you do not have “**red flag**” concerns with the draft.

If you do have such concerns, please provide us with a mark-up containing recommended language addressing the concern. “Red flag” concerns are intended to refer to inaccuracies or other fundamental problems in the text that take away from the integrity of the document. Due to time constraints, we are not asking you to focus on formatting, stylistic, syntax concerns, etc., (except to the extent you believe the text is fundamentally unreadable).

Please let us know if you have any questions, and provide your responses to me, Lynzi Barnes at [Barnes.edlynzia@epa.gov](mailto:Barnes.edlynzia@epa.gov)

Thanks,

Lynzi Barnes

U.S. Secretariat

Edlynzia Barnes

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Great Lakes National Program Office

77 W Jackson Blvd Chicago, IL

Phone: (312) 886-6249